

Attorney Docket No. 55522 (70904)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPELLANT: T. Sorihashi

CONF. NO.: 8376

U.S. SERIAL NO.: 09/757,726

EXAMINER: K. Stork

FILED: January 10, 2001

GROUP: 2178

FOR: INFORMATION PROCESSING DEVICE, INFORMATION
PROCESSING METHOD AND RECORDING MEDIUM STORING
COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR PROCESSING INFORMATION

Mail Stop Appeal Brief—Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Sir:

The following is in reply to the Examiner's Answer mailed March 7, 2007, in connection with the appeal of the above-referenced application.

This Reply Brief is being filed within two months of the mailing date of the Examiner's Answer. As such, this Reply Brief should be considered timely filed.

The following responds to remarks made in the "Response to Argument" section of the Examiner's Answer regarding the "three arguments" included in the Appellant's Appeal Brief filed on November 16, 2006.

In the Examiner's Answer, in response to Appellant's "first argument" that the proposed combination of Eintracht in view of Ichiriki does not teach or suggest a log recording/reproducing system which creates log data including history data of operations executed by a data creating section and a data reference section when creating a data file (see,

e.g., independent claim 1), the Examiner alleged: "The creation of the notes/annotations by the underlying system [of Eintracht] inherently includes a data creating section responsible for creating the notes/annotations in response to a user command" (see page 12, lines 13-15 of the Examiner's Answer).

However, independent claim 1 (and the other independent claims) recite a "log recording/reproducing section" that creates log data including "history data of operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section."

Referring to column 3, lines 12-36 of Eintracht, if the "notes database" is considered to correspond to the claimed "log data" (as alleged on page 3 of the Examiner's Answer), the "notes database" of Eintracht still does not include "history data of operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section" as claimed. Instead, the "notes" stored in the notes database of Eintracht refer to user-created notes for annotating a document in Eintracht.

In contrast, independent claim 1 recites that the log data created by the log recording/reproducing section must include "history data of operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section."

The notes stored in the notes database of Eintracht do not correspond to operations "executed by" a data creating section and a data reference section. Rather, the notes stored in the notes database of Eintracht are simply user-created notes, and thus not operations executed by a data creating section and a data reference section.

On page 13, lines 1-2 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner alleged that "adding notes to a data file" are "operations performed upon a document."

Appellant: T. Sorihashi
U.S. Serial No. 09/757,726
Reply Brief
Page 3 of 3

However, independent claim 1 (and the other independent claims) require that a log recording/reproducing section re-executes the operations stored in the log data.

The mere adding of notes to a data file is not the same as re-executing operations stored in log data, where the operations correspond to "operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section" as claimed.

Further, on page 13 of the Examiner's Answer, the Examiner alleged that Ichiriki could be combined with Eintracht because Ichiriki "discloses the creation of a file." However, even if these references are somehow combined, there is still no teaching or suggestion that notes stored in the notes database of Eintracht would include "history data of operations executed by said data creating section and said data reference section" as claimed.


There is no fee required for the submission of this Reply Brief. However, if, for any reason, a fee is deemed to be required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Date: May 7, 2007


Phone: (617) 239-0100

Customer No. 21874

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Conlin
(Reg. No. 27,026)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205



Application No. (if known): 09/757,726

Attorney Docket No.: 55522(70904)

Certificate of Express Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.10

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV 971740203 US in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on May 7, 2007
Date

Signature

Louise Rappaport

Typed or printed name of person signing Certificate

Registration Number, if applicable

(617) 239-0100
Telephone Number

Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing, or this certificate must identify each submitted paper.

Reply Brief To Examiner's Answer
Return stamped postcard
This Certificate of Express Mailing